



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/785,630

02/16/2001

Alex Magary

N0389.70005US00

3560

23628 7590 03/17/2009
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER

POINVIL, FRANTZY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3696

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/785,630	Applicant(s) MAGARY ET AL.	
	Examiner Frantzy Poinvil	Art Unit 3696	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2009.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-50, 59-74, 83-108 and 114-118 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-50, 59-74, 83-108 and 114-118 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/21/2009 has been entered.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/2009 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Claims 17-50, 59-74, 83-108 and 114-118 are pending. After a further search, the Examiner has discovered a new prior art applicable to the instant claims. The Examiner regrets the delayed process of the application. A rejection of claims 17-50, 59-74, 83-108 and 114-118 is found below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-50, 59-74, 83-108, 114-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burakoff et al (US Patent No. 6,782,506).

As per claims 17-50, 59-74, 83-108 and 114-118, Burakoff et al substantially disclose the invention as claimed. Particularly, Burakoff et al state:

"a computer-readable diskette or other physical electronic media is sent to a prospective investor through the mails using, for example, the U.S. Postal Service as the carrier or it is delivered to the prospective investor by hand. The diskette contains, in electronic digital format, a mutual fund prospectus. The prospective investor then inserts the diskette into a computer and, using one of a variety of possible text editors, word processors, or browsers, is able to display and read the prospectus on the computer monitor. The computer prompts the prospective investor in some fashion to respond to a request for consent to the electronic delivery of at least one additional compliance document or to the electronic delivery of a notification of the existence of at least one additional compliance document that the person agrees to obtain and review. Having secured the individual's consent, the software on the diskette and/or the computer then electronically communicates (e.g., via a network connection, a modem, etc.) that consent to some other computer for logging. That other computer could be a server maintained by, for example, the issuer of the mutual fund or an independent service. Depending on the specific consent requested and given, the individual might then sometime in the future receive by electronic mail ("email") an update to the mutual fund prospectus ("sticker") provided on the diskette, or the individual could receive a notification by email that a particular site on the World Wide Web has posted the mutual fund sticker and that the individual should view the sticker at that site by a certain date. The electronic connection is a computer communications link that can be made in a variety of ways including a direct dial-up connection, a private or public network connection, etc. The physical delivery of the diskette to the prospective investor thus is used as a mechanism to obtain consent from the prospective investor for future electronic delivery of additional compliance information. ".

See column 2, lines 15-50 of Burakoff et al.

The only difference between the system and method of Burakoff et al and the claimed invention is that Burakoff et al do not explicitly state for each of the plurality of distinct financial transactions as a function of its respective unique identifier, comparing the unique identifier to a collection of identifiers. As per this limitation, the Examiner notes that Burakoff et al concern with the consent of delivering financial transaction information (such as a prospectus and mutual funds) to an investor. A prospectus and mutual funds relate to a plurality of financial instruments having respective identifiers. An investor purchasing financial instruments must

have an identification or a client identifier in relation to the plurality of his/her financial instruments so that a financial company may positively identify specific financial instruments which relate to a particular investor. As such it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to introduce this limitation into the system and method of Burakoff et al in order to allow an investor to consent to receive financial information with respect to financial instruments which relate to him/her.

Furthermore, it is not clear that Burakoff et al positively state sending a paper-based representation of the financial transaction data associated with each unsuccessfully sent e-mail message. As per this limitation, it should be noted that the financial transaction is usually transmitted by sending a paper-based representation of the financial transaction to the respective investors. The objective of the system and method of Burakoff et al is to allow the electronic provision of financial information to investors who have consented to receive their financial transactions in an electronic manner such as via email. The Examiner asserts that if a recipient has failed to receive their financial information unsuccessfully via an E-mail system, then sending a paper-based representation of the financial transaction data associated with each unsuccessfully sent E-mail message would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do in the system and method of Burakoff et al. in order to assure that the requester does receive the requested information or to receive their required financial information.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantzy Poinvil whose telephone number is (571) 272-

6797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/Frantzy Poinvil/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3696**

FP
March 12, 2009